THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN
AND HIS DILEMMA

A GRADUATE COURSE PAPER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS IN COUNSELING

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
MUNCIE, INDIANA

JANUARY 1971

Prepared by

Chaplain Jerry D. Autry

6th Missile Battalion

52d Air Defense Artillery

APO 09801

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	page 1
Problem	page 2
The Historical Role of the Military Chaplain	page 2
The Military's Concept of the Chaplain's Role	page 4
The Chaplain's Role As His Parishoners See Him	page 5
The Chaplain's Role As He Sees It	page 8
A. The Chaplain's Stereotyped Image	page 8
B. Why the Military?	page 11
C. Competitiveness	page 13
The Chaplain's Place in the Command Structure	page 13
Conclusions and Suggestions	page 20

The role of the military Chaplain is probably one of the most misunderstood in the history of the clergy. He is viewed by many of his civilian counterparts as one who has left the ministry. This view is further fostered by a lack of knowledge on the part of his civilian counterparts and a lack of tolerance of any type of ministry other than the institutional church pastorate.

The military Chaplain's further dilemma is increased because of a lack of understanding of what his role really is within the command structure of the military. Is he there for the benefit of the enlisted man or is he there to help out the Commander? His primary constituency, the lower ranking enlisted men (draftees, as they prefer to be called), are suspicious of him. To many of them, he is identified with their nemesis, the Army, the so-called Green Machine, and is definately part of the establishment.

When all of these facts are added to his own feelings concerning his role and function, the dilemma is very much in evidence. (For the purposes of this paper, the word "role" will generally be used to mean the individual's perception of himself and "function" to mean what he actually does.) There are many times when he wonders who he

is. He is a minister in uniform -- an officer. He has rank. He is a counselor, an administrator, and a thousand other things. He is a minister, unconcerned about the rewards of this life, and yet competing with other officers and even other ministers in a structure of rank, reward, and privilege. He lives in a world of the military elite and yet seeks to minister to the military deprived. He seeks to serve the masses, and yet is removed from them.

PROBLEM:

The purpose of this paper is to examine and answer some aspects of the above question in considering the Chaplain historically, as the Army has determined his role by regulation, as his parishoners see him, and as he sees himself.

THE HISTORICAL ROLE OF THE MILITARY CHAPLAIN:

The historical concept of the military Chaplain probably dates back to the early days of Biblical times when Aaron and his descendents became the spiritual advisors to the people of Israel. However, for our purposes here, we want to consider briefly the American version of the Army Chaplain. The historical Chaplaincy has been an ever changing role. How the Chaplain has acted and reacted appears to be proportionate to the type of conflict in which he found himself. The Civil War pointed up the dilemma; a confederate Chaplain said that

slavery was a local matter, blamed the War on Northern preachers and their attacks upon slavery, and charged them with corrupting the gospel.[1]

The military Chaplain, however, appeared to come into his own during the two great wars. His record of courage, concern for his men, and wholesome influence earned for him the lovable titles of "Chappy" and "Padre." By the end of World War II, the Chaplain appeared to be firmly entrenched as a permanent part of the military establishment and the catch-off for all of the military man's problems became, "Tell it to the Chaplain."[2]

With the advent of the Korean War, a new type of Chaplain arrived on the military scene. He was better educated and seemingly more determined to minister to the whole man. No longer was he willing to be concerned with the man as he saw him on Sunday or during the worship service. The total man, at work, at play, at war, was his vital concern.

Beginning with the years from Korea and into Viet Nam, the Chaplain, as a man of God seeking to minister to a military community, has undergone an even greater change. With a changed emphasis in many theology

---

[1] Roy J. Honeywell, Chaplains of the United States Army, p. 89.

[2] Ibid.

and divinity schools, the military Chaplain has found himself influenced by various concepts: the church in the world as promegated by Harvey Cox's The Secular City, Victor Frankel's logotherapy and existentialism, various theological controversies, and certainly by the new discipline of clinical pastoral education.

THE MILITARY'S CONCEPT OF THE CHAPLAIN'S ROLE:

The military has sought to clearly define the Chaplain's role by way of regulations which spell out his function and duties. As with all rules, they have constantly expanded. The basic regulation is one which is called AR165-20. Add to this one, the various supplements, annexes, and changes, and the Chaplain is beset with such a vast complexity of rules that they seem to restrict him in self expression and personal initiative.

These regulations coupled with the various supervisory Chaplain interpretations, commander's interpretation of them, and individual Chaplain's interpretations often lend themselves to broad misinterpretation which ultimately can significantly affect the performance of the military Chaplin. However, the regulations can serve the Chaplain as written clarification of job description and in such important matters as privileged communication.

The implementation of the regulation depends upon the individual

Chaplain and how well he understands his own role and function within the scope and context of the regulation. As a rule, most Chaplains are unaffected by anything within the regulations which they consider to be restrictive.

THE CHAPLAIN'S ROLE AS HIS PARISHONERS SEE HIM:

Relating to the bulk of his parishoners is probably the greatest challenge that the military Chaplain faces. He is an officer and as an officer, is accorded the privileges of one. Therefore, the question must continually come into focus concerning how he can perform his function as minister while wearing the rank of officer. This controversy, that of rank for the Chaplain, has long been one that occasionally surfaces for various reasons. The suggestion has been made that the military Chaplain be somewhat like the Red Cross, that he have a civilian service rating, or that he be a civilian paid by his denomination.

Probably the best approach to take in the understanding of the Chaplain's dilemma in relating to many of the young men who are in the Army today is to try to understand two types of individuals and how they came to be part of the military. With the changes in the draft system in the last few years, there are now primarily two types of young men who have been drafted into service.

One category falls under the name of "Project 100,000." These are men who were caught under the criterion of lowered intelligence standards, and have relunctantly entered the Army. The other group, and by far the more significant, are those young men who were drafted due to the discontinuance of deferments, primarily those for graduate students. Many of them were graduate students, but a large number had already begun careers in various occupations. Their lives interrupted, it is only natural that they brought with them their resentments, hostilities, and frustrations. Coupled with the fact that many of these men were actively opposed to the Viet Nam War and military conscription, their becoming members of the armed forces was almost intolerable. Many young troops today honestly admit that they seriously considered fleeing to Canada or going to jail. The Army, they say, is the lesser evil, but still an evil.

How does the military Chaplain relate to these young men? Through no real fault of his own, he is part of the establishment. How does he fulfill his ministry to them whether they want it or not? Can he afford to let their hostility toward the Army thwart any advancements with them that he might make? How do they really feel toward the Chaplain?

To determine whether or not the two types of young troops actually possessed the attitudes previously mentioned, the writer surveyed a

selected number. Those selected were a controlled sample inasmuch as they were all draftees and the majority possessed some schooling beyond high school. In the sampling, there were ten questions. Of these questions, two were judged by the writer to be significant for the subject of this paper. The particular questions asked were chosen on the basis of the subject matter of this paper, as an evaluation tool by the writer, and personal choice.

One question, "Do you consider the Chaplain to be part of 'the establishment'?," was answered positively by thirty men and negatively by only fourteen. Another question asked was, "Would you be more comfortable with a civilian minister than with a Chaplain?" The answers were about evenly divided. The answers to this question appears to follow the logic of many who have been pushing for a civilian clergy to serve the military. However, the sticky question of what to do in wartime would be involved. Also, this points up the problem of the indentification of the Chaplain with the military establishment.

The validity of this particular survey is questionable primarily because of the writer's relationship with those who took it. Being as objective as possible, the writer feels that his relationships and rapport with this particular group has possibly affected their objectivity.

However, the two questions mentioned in the paper appear to be valid as far as the writer is concerned.

Much of the answer, then, of dealing with the overall problem of this frustration, appears to end up on a most personal level. It is an individual thing and depends upon the individual Chaplain's ability to gain rapport with the young men in military service today and the Chaplain's ability to be able to relate to them in a meaningful way.

THE CHAPLAIN'S ROLE AS HE SEES IT:

Another frustration of the military Chaplain has to do with combatting the stereotyped image of himself and with his own feelings concerning himself and his role as a Chaplain.

The Chaplain's Stereotyped Image:

The Chaplain has been typically portrayed as an inept religious and holy man with super-human morality. In books and movies he has been pictured as the humorous, well meaning minister or priest whose concept of religion as relating to the practicalities of life is almost zero. In the book, MASH, and later the movie, he is continually praying over military vehicles, is the brunt of many a joke, and is completely oblivious to what is really going on. As a combat Chaplain in the movie, Patton, he is called upon to write a prayer which will enable the tanks of Patton to roll unhindered by the weather into the height

of battle. He writes the prayer; the weather is good, and the tanks roll victoriously on. The Chaplain accomplished his mission and so did the Army. Therefore, God has heard his prayers and it is safe to assume that he is a good Chaplain. One wonders what might have happened to the Chaplain had not the weather lifted and the tanks rolled on.

In Ric Hardman's very funny book, The Chaplain's Raid, three Chaplains are portrayed as trying continually to stop one young trooper from forever becoming a servant to sin. They are shown as moralistic bunglers, inadequate in most areas. The situation is real enough, but the characterization of the Chaplains is forever unreal.

The picture of the Chaplain is somewhat humorous, and yet less than that, of a man. At one point in the aforementioned book, Chaplain Hallowell exclaims, "Hath not Chaplains eyes? Hath not a Chaplain hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, and passions?" His dilemma sums up the personal one for Chaplains, their image as Chaplains and as men.[1]

The profound question of the Chaplain's feelings about himself probably constitutes the most important aspect of the entire problem. Of course, the problem actually embraces a question that is much larger and encompasses the total question of the modern day minister's

---

[1]Ric Hardman, The Chaplain's Raid, p. 139.

frustrations. In an article in the magazine, Pastoral Psychology, entitled "Clergymen in Conflict," Thomas C. McGinnis makes this statement:

> Every clergymen must relate to and deal with multiple and complex role expectations. He must understand the discrepancies between what he thinks parishoners expect and what they really expect, and help them to understand the discrepancies between what they think the clergyman expects and what he really expects. He has to decide if he wants to be a specialist or a generalist. That is, should he emphasize counseling and de-emphasize most other role expectations? Should he emphasize the teachings of Christ or his own personal ethics? Should he try to help solve man's social problems or deal with his lack of faith in God? Should he emphasize communitymanship, churchmanship, familymanship, or selfship? Should he use his sermon time to 'tell off' or manipulate parishoners, or should the sermon be geared to stimulate spiritual-emotional feedback between the clergyman and the parishoners? Should his schedule be rigid and formal or on a catch-as-catch-can basis? Should he accept the community status quo or try to alter it? Should he accept the fact that church life is oriented around women or should he spend more time trying to reach men by making the church more relavent to them? Should he try to identify with the business executive and his multifarious concerns or should he relate rather exclusively to the executive's spiritual life? Should he be mainly an observer or a participant in church activities such as parties, painting, and constructing?[1]

The minister must continually evaluate and reevaluate these basic concepts. Although he may have come to some definitive conclusions early in his ministry concerning his thinking, he must continue to reassesshis role.

McGinnis further points out that the clergyman faces the same

---

[1]Thomas C. McGinnis, "Clergymen in Conflict," Pastoral Psychology, p. 15-16, October, 1969.

basic crises that every young professional faces and yet the frustrations are more exaggerated. His ideas and interpersonal relationships are exposed to public view. His involvements with his people range from the extremes of happiness, such as in performing the marriage service, to the extremes of sadness, as in aiding those bereaved by death. Although it is generally recognized that he is his own boss, his working hours are too long, often extending through all daytime and nighttime hours, often through holidays and vacations. The pressures upon his home life are immense. The family lives in a fish bowl and longs for the day when they can let their hair down and be themselves.[1]

While basically the same frustrations hold true for the military Chaplain as for the civilian clergyman, they are more pronounced in some areas of personal conflict. The military Chaplain, in evaluating his role in the military structure, must also evaluate his function as minister and officer.

WHY THE MILITARY?:

There are many things that the Chaplain must come to grips with in analyzing his own frustrations. Why he chose the military service in the first place for the means of exercising his ministry is an appropriate place to start.

---

[1] Ibid.

While it is true that the military salary structure exceeds that of starting salaries in some denominations, it hardly seems feasible that this motivation would be an overwhelming one. Military service could well serve as a form of escapism for many ministers. Freedom from many church organizations, women's groups, financial campaigns, church budgets, and the myriad of other civilian church encumbrances is indeed attractive to many ministers. The military, for the average civilian clergyman, could appear as the greener pasture, the more secure position, and possibly fulfill the secret desire for adventure.

The above is certainly not the only possible reason why a minister might join the military. Another reason could stem from the fact that there are a large number of Army veterans in the average church and the minister could feel left out of this circle, void of some important experience, and even feel guilty for not having served his country. A third reason could simply be the desire for travel, both for himself and for his family. Inwardly, the desire to remove the feeling of living in a glass house for himself and his family could also enter into his decision.

To possess any of these feelings is not necessarily bad. Quite the contrary, recognizing them is the key. When the Chaplain admits his reasons for being in the military, some of his frustration

disappears because he admits that it is something that he has chosen. He has exercised his free will.

Competitiveness

One of the frequent areas of frustration which is seldom admitted is that of competitiveness. It is infrequently admitted because it is not in keeping with the image of the sincere, humble, honest man of God. However, many times it is his very aggressiveness which has led him into the military and the Chaplaincy in the first place. If a young Chaplain has this frustration, it may be construed as a personality defect which he must recognize and deal with. The behavior is most characterized by the Chaplain's steady persuance of correct career patterns regardless of all other considerations.

For example, a Chaplain decides to volunteer for a hardship tour away from his family because it is good for his career. Therefore, he is ahead of his contemporaries due to the fact that he has sacrificed more; i.e. volunteered for a second tour to an isolated area. This competitiveness is generally recognized as healthy, but there are times when it can get in the way of the Chaplain, the parishoner, and the work itself.

THE CHAPLAIN'S PLACE IN THE COMMAND STRUCTURE:

One area of great concern to many military Chaplains is the entire relationship to the military command structure. For instance,

can a Chaplain honestly serve God, maintain his convictions, and also be a part of the military establishment? In other words, does command exert undue influence, either directly or indirectly, upon his decisions, convictions, and ultimately, his behavior?

While much of the above question is somewhat academic and depends upon the individual Chaplain and/or Commander, it must be understood and realized that the Chaplain, because of his position in the military structure, is involved both with those who would upset it and those who rule it. For example, there are those problems of discipline wherein commanders punish, and yet those that he punishes are also the Chaplain's parishoners and counselees. Many times, the Chaplain is caught in the middle. He continually has to answer the question of where his loyalty lies. Is it a question of right or wrong, either/or?

Certainly there are command pressures, sometimes subtle, which would have the Chaplain undermine confidences, betray loyalties, and disclose privileged information. The Chaplain is continually on a tightrope in the area of discipline, troop morale, and personal responsibility. There are times when he must weigh his responsibility to command and society, as opposed to that toward the individual. For example, an individual may be in a key place of responsibility in which national security could possibly be in jeapordy, and he discloses to the Chaplain his involvement with drugs, alcohol, or other personal

problems. Where does the Chaplain's responsibility lie?

Although this problem isn't peculiar to the military, due to the sensitive natures of the missions of various military units, the problem is more pronounced. Exactly how the Chaplain does perceive of himself and his role depends upon how he views his relationship to the military structure.

In May of 1969, an article appeared in Time entitled, "Can a Man Serve God and the Pentagon Too?" This article primarily related to the Viet Nam War, although there were references to other places of service where the Chaplain finds himself. The article pointed out various periods of crises and used individual Chaplains' experiences to point out how the various problems of serving in the military were faced, how individual Chaplains reacted to the situations, and what they perceived of their role being in the various crises.

For instance, one Chaplain, at the Post Stockade at the Presidio in California, felt no responsibility toward the supposedly terrible conditions and plight of the prisoners in confinement there. He perceived his role as that of a spiritual and religious advisor who did not become involved in the problems of the management. In addition, several Chaplains indicated that they were opposed to the Viet Nam War and yet they felt that it was a place of service, and the issues of

war, right or wrong, did not supplant their responsibilities as ministers to men in need. One Chaplain indicated that he saw his role as ministering to the men, regardless of where they were; i.e. the jungles, combat operations, etc. The article pointed up precisely the dilemma of the military Chaplain and also the ultimate conclusion, if not the solution.

In the March-April 1971 issue of the magazine, The Chaplain, a journal primarily designed for Chaplains in the armed forces, hospitals, and penal institutions, two articles appeared which are truly definitive of the dilemma and also bring some solution to it. The first article is by Chester A. Pennington and is entitled, "The Ministry of Our Chaplains."

Simply stated, Mr. Pennington basically sought to define the nature of the ministry of the Chaplain.

> It is the responsibility of the church to minister to people wherever they are. As long as there are men and women in military service, in hospitals or homes, and in prisons, the church will serve them. These ministries are called Chaplaincies.
>
> An important distinction must be made at this point. The church may regret, even deplore, even oppose the circumstances which bring people to these places. We are against crime, against war — and hardly in favor of illness. But when people are caught in these conditions we will serve them. Our distaste for the systems and circumstances does not deter us from ministering to the people involved. That's

> our job. And on the other hand, our ministering to these people does not diminish our opposition to the causes which bring them to these places. That's our job too.[1]

He further noted the three tensions, of which two are noteworthy for this paper, which he also called opportunities, which mark the ministry: to be servant of both church and state, to be both pastor and officer. In relation to this, he says:

> Now, just because these people to whom we minister stand in special relation to the state — drafted, arrested, hospitalized — so do we as ministers stand in a special relation to the state. The government has its own procedures to follow, its own standards to meet — whether of medical care, forms of punishment, or military duties. And the minister who serves under these procedures and standards must acknowledge this responsibility to them.
>
> Ordinarily, this occasions no conflict. Because in this instance, the state — as well as the church — is seeking the greatest good for those for whom both institutions share responsibility. The Chaplain may work to change procedures and practices. But he will work within the system. He can do this because he believes that he is serving the state as well as the church by seeking the best good of his people.[2]

The second conflict is in being pastor and officer. He states:

> The Chaplain's rank need not be a barrier between himself and his men. In fact, it can be an instrument to fulfill his ministry to them. And I suspect that this is the intent of his position. As an officer, he shares in certain decision making responsibilities. As an officer, he has certain powers and privileges which enable him to minister on behalf of his men. Incidentally, he is supposed to be pastor to his fellow officers too.

---

[1] Chester A. Pennington, "The Ministry of Our Chaplains," The Chaplain, p. 3-4, March-April, 1971.

[2] Ibid., p. 5.

> In a recent conversation with a Chaplain I was told about an article in which some young veterans wrote about this. They put it beautifully. A Chaplain bears rank, not to exercise authority, but to serve his people. He bears rank for others! It is an instrument by which he, not commands, but serves.
>
> A Chaplain's uniform — bearing the insignia of the cross — is no more handicap than a civilian's clerical collar. In both instances, it all depends on how the wearer uses it.
>
> A Chaplain is, I believe, free to maintain his own integrity. He may have to risk displeasur or opposition. But this is not unknown in the church itself. His relations with his commanding officer may sometimes be strained — but the fault isn't always one-sided. The use of power is not a problem unique to the military. It is present in the church as well. A Chaplain is as free as the minister of a local parish. And the government sustains him in the free exercise of his ministry.
>
> A Chaplain is free to express his own conscience and form his own judgment. To be a Chaplain does not mean to be in agreement with every policy of the military or political authorities. Some of my most agonizing discussions of the legitimacy of killing have been with Chaplains who are living and working with men and their families who are caught up in the terrible business of war. Some of the most searching criticisms of national policy have been voiced by Chaplains.[1]

In essence, I interpret Mr. Pennington's comments as saying yes, the problems, the frustrations, and the questions are there. These difficulties are not insurmountable. The Chaplain's ability to rise above these problems truly makes him a servant of all the people.

The second article in The Chaplain is by Kenneth Hamstra and is entitled, "The Chaplaincy in the Sizzling Seventies." The basic

---

1 [1]Ibid., p. 7.

pitch of the article is the changing Chaplaincy, the new minister, and what must be done. Basically, he appears to be saying that some of the new ministers are straight from the fringes of the activism of social problems, but most will come from the diverse majority which watches thoughtfully while preparing for individual commitment. He says that the spirit of the "new Breed" is ready to have its impact on organized religion.

> Many of tomorrow's Chaplains will lack the skills and interests we hold sacred, but they are the major "given" in God's new equation. If they don't fit, so be it. The Chaplaincy (as we know it) may have to "die" before it can utilize the talents which God provides.[1]

Hamstra says change is here and we had better get with it. The problems are myriad, complex, and supersensitive.

> We will discover that we seldom know how to talk with, or show love toward, those from deprived backgrounds or with little education. We had better learn fast!
>
> We are, by and large, white collar Anglos. We need to learn more about "Anglo" as a repressive force, and "whitey" as a curse.
>
> We must shed our perimeter jousting with drugs, alcohol, and compulsive sexual exercise, and get into the maelstroms which produce such behavior.
>
> For, as we move toward a "volunteer force," here are our people.[2]

Change we must. There is no longer any place for the man in the military Chaplaincy who defines his role as that of the spiritual

---

[1]Kenneth W. Hamstra, "The Chaplaincy in the Sizzling Seventies," The Chaplain, p. 11, March-April, 1971.

[2]Ibid., p. 12.

and religious advisor to the commander. He can no longer sit behind the hallowed walls of the chapel, preparing Sunday morning's sermon to be heard by the faithful. The Chaplain must be where things are happening. Hamstra further says:

> A thoughtful bumper sticker proclaims: "America — Change It or Lose It."
>
> So it is with the Chaplaincy in the seventies. Thank God we have the 'new' breed to lean upon, to help us change.
>
> For there, around us, are God's people. He loves them, whether they acknowledge us or not.
>
> God grant us the grace to be their Chaplains, totally open to the divine dunamis; loving, serving, suffering as God may direct.[1]

The usual thing to do when coming to the end of a paper such as this is to draw a summary and logical conclusion. Throughout this paper, the writer has attempted to draw some type of conclusion, although the subject does not really lend itself to any cut and dried solution to the problem at hand. However, there are some conclusions which can be seen.

First of all, the resolutions of many of the questions which have been raised throughout this paper are dependent upon the individual Chaplain. His personality, convictions, "modus operandi," background, etc. all have to be taken into consideration. Unless

---

[1] Ibid.

the Chaplaincy can change, as Kenneth Hamstra has pointed out, then a drastic alternative appears to be in order. Although the writer doesn't necessarily advocate it, it is worth considering if for no other reason than its shhok value.

This alternative would be to do away with the professional Chaplain as we know him today. Under this plan, no longer would it be possible for an individual to come into the Army as a Chaplain and remain for thirty years. The Chaplain would come into the Army for a period of not more than five years. During this time, he would function solely as a minister, ministering to men and families of the armed forces. He would be chosen by a board of his denomination and would be assured of a position once he left the Army.

The various boards of the denominations would maintain strict and close liason with the individual Chaplain to make sure that he was not being subject to prejudices, subtle influence, etc. and that he was indeed fundtioning as a minister should function. If the military had any complaints concerning his behavior, they would be free to take them to his denominational board. The individual Chaplain would wear the uniform and actually be a part of the military and the system. However, he would be relieved of all the pressure of making rank, being an officer with hope of advancement, and developing

proper career patterns.

By eliminating the professional Chaplaincy, the problem of individual ministers being assimilated into the military system and mesmerized into thinking that the system is never questioned would be eliminated. The individual Chaplain would continually be free to maintain his own convictions, question the rights and wrongs of the system, adequately relate to and serve all the men, and be exposed to a growing, maturing experience, unsurpassed in preparing himself for a return to the civilian ministry. Of course, this drastic step will not be taken very soon, if ever. In the meantime, three suggestions can be made to today's military Chaplains.

The Chaplain must admit that the frustrations are present, and regardless of how threatening this knowledge may be, the frustration must be faced in all of its reality. To use an overworked phrase, the Chaplain must be true to himself. He can never afford to compromise or sacrifice his own integrity. Today's Chaplain must be willing to be the agent for change, to be the fly in the ointment, as he constantly evaluates, reevaluates, and serves in the military service.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Hardman, Ric. The Chaplain's Raid. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1965. 256 pages.

Honeywell, Roy J. Chaplains of the United States Army. Washington: Department of the Army, 1958. 376 pages.

O'Connor, John J. A Chaplain Looks at Vietnam. Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1968. 256 pages.

Magazine Articles

Hamstra, Kenneth W. "The Chaplaincy in the Sizzling Seventies." The Chaplain. 10-12; March-April, 1971.

McGinnis, Thomas C. "Clergymen in Comflict." Pastoral Psychology. 13-20; October, 1969.

Pennington, Chester A. "the Ministry of Our Chaplains." The Chaplain. 3-12; March-April, 1971.